

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed June 28, 2005, has been received and reviewed. Claims 1 through 20, and 43 through 58 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 through 20, and 43 through 58 stand rejected. Claims 21-42 and 59-99 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention, and have been canceled. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 43, and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as amended herein.

**Preliminary Amendment**

Applicants' undersigned attorney notes the filing herein of a Preliminary Amendment on April 29, 2004, which filing was not acknowledged in the outstanding Office Action. Should the Preliminary Amendment have failed for some reason to have been entered in the Office file, Applicants' undersigned attorney will be happy to have a true copy thereof hand-delivered to the Examiner.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 1 and 43 are objected to due to informalities in the claim language. Appropriate correction has been made.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Anticipation Rejections**

**Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Publication No. 2001/0020545 A1 to Eldridge**

Claims 1 through 20, and 43 through 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Benjamin N. Eldridge (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0020545 A1) (hereinafter "Benjamin"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants submit that the Benjamin reference does not and cannot anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102 the presently claimed invention of presently amended independent claims 1 and 43, and claims 2-20 and 44-58, respectively depending therefrom, because the Benjamin reference does not describe, either expressly or inherently, the identical inventions in as complete detail as are contained in the claims.

The Office Action alleges:

Regard claim 1: Benjamin discloses in figure 10A – 10J a contact pin assembly, comprising: a substantially planar substrate (1008), a first contact pin (a straight portion of 1050 and 1050a as shown in figure 10E) having a contact end on a first side of the substrate (1008) and formed in a place from a first portion of the substrate (1008); and first compliant coupling structure (1026 included 1020 rhodium, 1022 nickel and 1024 gold layer, page 37, paragraph 0636) to couple the first contact pin (a straight portion between 1050a and 1050 as show in figure 10E) in an orthogonally compliant orientation with the substantially planar substrate (1008). (Office Action, pp. 2-3; emphasis added).

Regard claim 43: Benjamin discloses in figure 11A – 11F a contactor card, comprising: a substrate (1008) configured for attachment with a semiconductor tester (it is capable of such an attachment and at least one contact pin (like claim 1) formed in place from a first portion of the substrate; and first compliant coupling structure (like claim 1) to couple the first contact pin (like claim 1) in an orthogonally compliant orientation with the substrate. (Office Action, p. 6; emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully disagree that the Benjamin reference anticipates Applicants' invention as presently claimed in presently amended independent claim 1 which reads:

1. A contact pin assembly, comprising:  
a substantially planar substrate;  
a first contact pin having a contact end on a first side of the substrate, ***the first contact pin formed in place and formed from a first portion of the substrate***; and  
first compliant coupling structure to couple the first contact pin in a substantially orthogonal orientation with the substantially planar substrate. (Emphasis added.)

In contrast, the Benjamin reference discloses:

FIG. 10E illustrates that a wire 1050 is bonded at both its ends 1050a and 1050b (in a manner akin to that of the aforementioned loop 802) between the contact areas 1042 on the PCB 1040 and the material (1022) in the openings on the sacrificial substrate 1008 to make an electrical connection therebetween. For example, a one end 1050a of the wire 1050 is ball bonded to the layer 1022 in the area 1012, and an other end 1050b is wedge bonded to the contact area 1042. (Paragraph 0641).

Clearly, the Benjamin reference discloses “a first contact pin” in the form of wire 1050. However, Applicants’ invention as claimed, in part, “a first contact pin having a contact end on a first side of the substrate, ***the first contact pin . . . formed from a first portion of the substrate***” is not anticipated by Benjamin’s disclosure of a wire 1050. Applicants’ contact pin, as presently claimed, is “formed from a first portion of the substrate”. In contrast, the Benjamin wire 1050 is not formed “in place” nor is it “formed from a first portion of the substrate” as claimed by Applicants.

Therefore, presently amended independent claim 1, and claims 2-20 depending therefrom, are not anticipated by the Benjamin reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, such claims are allowable over the cited prior art and Applicants respectfully request that such rejections be withdrawn.

Regarding presently amended independent claim 43 and claims 44-58 depending therefrom, Applicants respectfully sustain the above-proffered arguments and submit that the Benjamin reference does not disclose Applicants’ invention as presently claimed in amended independent claim 43 which reads, in part, “***a first contact pin*** formed in place and ***formed from a first portion of the substrate***”. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 43, and claims 44-58 depending therefrom, are not anticipated by the Benjamin reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, such claims are allowable over the cited prior art and Applicants respectfully request that such rejections be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Claims 1 through 20 and 43 through 58 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Johanson', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Kevin K. Johanson  
Registration No. 38,506  
Attorney for Applicants  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: September 7, 2005  
KKJ/dlm:lmh

Document in ProLaw